

ED 025 476

SP 002 060

By- Senf, Rita

Followup Study of 1966 Summer Institutes for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects, 1966-67.

Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.

Spons Agency- New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Oct 67

Note- 57p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.95

Descriptors- Attitude Tests, Behavior Rating Scales, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Institutes (Training Programs), Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, *Teacher Behavior, *Teacher Education

Identifiers- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, ESEA Title I, New York, *New York City

A followup study (to ED 011 018) was conducted to obtain data concerning the impact of the 1966 Summer Institutes program on the subsequent classroom activities of the participants. The Institutes had been designed to improve the quality of instruction in public and nonpublic schools in disadvantaged areas of New York City by providing for the training of teachers, supervisors, and administrators currently teaching or preparing to teach disadvantaged students in grades one to eight. In the followup study, questionnaire data was secured from pairs of teachers (one of whom attended the summer institute and one of whom did not) within the same school and when possible teaching the same grade level. Of the 52 pairs observed, approximately half were from public and half from nonpublic schools; of the institute participants approximately half had taken one or two courses, the other half three or four. Each pair was observed during one hour of teaching by one of nine observers using a rating scale. Data was analyzed by means of analysis of variance, chi square tests, and Pearson product-moment correlations. (Findings are presented and discussed and conclusions drawn, most of them supporting the original study, with some reservations noted. Tables of data--including that on individual items in the Teacher Attitude Inventory--and the teacher questionnaire and observation rating scale are appended.) (JS)

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

FOLLOWUP STUDY OF 1966 SUMMER INSTITUTES FOR
TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

Rita Senf

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation of a New York City school district
educational project funded under Title I of
the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of
1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with
the Board of Education of the City of New York
for the 1966-67 school year.

ED025476

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

October 1967

SP002060

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	1
EVALUATION DESIGN	2
DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENTS	4
FINDINGS	8
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
APPENDIX A: Tables	A1
APPENDIX B: Instruments	B1
APPENDIX C: Staff List	C1

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of this followup study was to obtain data concerning the impact of the 1966 Summer Institutes program on the subsequent classroom activities of participants at the Institutes. Dr. Marvin Gewirtz completed an evaluation of the immediate effects of the program in September 1966;¹ thus it was not possible for him to report on teachers' actual classroom behavior.

A brief review of the objectives and the program of the 1966 Summer Institutes will provide the necessary background. The following statement, taken from Dr. Gewirtz's evaluation, is a condensation from the original Board of Education Title I project description:

"The basic objective of the Summer Institutes ... was to improve the quality of instruction in public and nonpublic schools in disadvantaged areas of New York City (by providing) for the training of teachers, supervisors, and administrators currently teaching or preparing to teach disadvantaged students in grades 1 through 8. More specifically, the Summer Institutes set out to achieve three major objectives:

1. To acquaint (the participants) with the nature of the disadvantaged child, his environmental background, and his specific needs.
2. To introduce the participants to new curricula, organizations, materials, and electronic devices that would be useful in teaching the disadvantaged, and
3. To help the participant develop a personal sensitivity to the disadvantaged child and a sense of confidence in dealing with him in a classroom situation."

¹ Marvin H. Gewirtz. Teaching the Disadvantaged - Summer Institutes for Professional Training of Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. Title I Evaluation, Center for Urban Education, September 1966. (ED 011 018)

The Summer Institutes offered two-week courses in four subject areas: Urban Living, English, History and Social Studies, and Mathematics and Science. All four courses were given in each of four successive sessions, in ten different centers throughout the city. Participants could take 1, 2, 3, or all 4 courses. From approximately 5500 applicants, 3258 teachers, supervisors, and administrators were selected for enrollment. About 90 to 95 per cent of the participants were teachers; about one-fifth of the total space was allotted to applicants from nonpublic schools. In screening applicants, priority was given to those who were teaching or expected to teach disadvantaged children. Participants received a stipend. They took on the average two courses each. All data collected during the summer of 1966 were anonymous, so it is not possible to investigate subsequent changes within individuals.

EVALUATION DESIGN

Since the primary concern of this followup study was to examine teaching behavior, only people who were teaching during the 1966-67 school year were accepted as subjects; supervisors and administrators were eliminated. The plan of this followup study was to secure data from pairs of teachers within the same school and preferably teaching the same grade level, one of whom attended the summer institutes and one of whom did not; no other matching criteria were used. These subjects will be referred to as attenders and nonattenders. Half the subjects were to teach in public schools and half in nonpublic schools. It seemed possible that the total number of courses taken might be a relevant variable; therefore the design provided that half the attenders

would have taken 1 or 2 courses, and the other half, 3 or 4 courses. In addition, all subjects had to agree to be observed for one hour or one class period, and to fill out a questionnaire, to be described below.

The securing of subjects proceeded in stages, and at each stage there was about a 50 per cent loss. No listing of names of attenders was available to us, so we first listed a large sample of names of public and nonpublic school teachers from the file of original applications for the institutes, furnished through the courtesy of Samuel Polatnick, Principal of Springfield Gardens High School and Coordinator of the Summer Institutes program. After checking personnel records and eliminating those who were not now classroom teachers, we sent letters of explanation to principals, listed names of (assumed) attenders in their schools, and asked them to supply names of nonattenders teaching the same grade level.

The securing of subject names began in January 1967; observations and data collection began in March and continued through June. After securing the teachers' agreement to the visit of an observer, principals informed teachers in advance as to when they would be observed. There were nine observers, eight female and one male; they were former principals in New York City schools or experienced teachers. Both members of a pair of teachers were rated by the same observer. The observer was not told their attender-nonattender status. After a pair of teachers had been observed, the questionnaire was mailed to them. A pair of subjects was not retained unless both were observed and both filled out the questionnaire.

The original evaluation design called for 30 attender-nonattender pairs in public schools and 30 pairs in nonpublic schools. The numbers of subjects finally secured were as follows:

	Number of Summer Courses Taken		
	0	1 or 2	3 or 4
Public	25	15	10
<u>Nonpublic</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	52	27	25

The 25 public school attender-nonattender pairs came from 21 schools. The 27 nonpublic school pairs of teachers came from 26 schools (24 Catholic, 1 Lutheran, 1 Greek Orthodox). These schools were in all five boroughs of New York City. In most cases the two members of each pair taught the same grade level. The grade levels taught were fairly evenly spread over grades 1 through 8.

DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENTS

Two instruments were used (see Appendix B). A classroom observation form was devised to be usable with any grade level or subject matter that observers might encounter in the schools. It contained 20 scales for recording various aspects of the teacher-class interaction, and one scale for the observer's overall evaluation of the teaching-learning situation. The 20 items were oriented toward material that had been stressed in the summer institutes; for example, "To what extent does the teacher attempt to relate the class work to the pupils' environment and life experiences?" These were five-point scales, with 1 being the poorest and 5 the best score; there was also the option of marking the item "not scorable." Observers recorded substantiating comments for each rating. Each observation covered one hour or one class period.

A questionnaire for teachers provided data to permit analyses parallel to those done by Dr. Gewirtz in his evaluation, plus some additional data, as follows:

1. Identifying information, parallel to Gewirtz. Classification variables to be examined include type of school, grade level taught, years of teaching experience, and years of experience in teaching disadvantaged children.

2. Teacher Attitude Inventory; 40 items (Nos. 45 - 84), same as Gewirtz. See discussion below.

3. Reactions (ratings) from the teacher to a set of 17 statements about what she (or he) has actually done in the classroom during the school year. These were oriented toward material presented in the summer institutes. There was a five-point rating scale, ranging from 1, Never, to 5, Very often. These will be referred to as fact items (Nos. 14 - 30).

4. Reactions (ratings) to a corresponding set of 14 statements about what the teacher considers important to her own success as a teacher. This five-point rating scale ranged from 1, No importance, to 5, Essential. These will be referred to as importance items (Nos. 31 - 44).

5. Open-ended items for attenders and nonattenders, concerning what further training they desire, and what qualities they consider important to successful teaching of disadvantaged children.

6. Open-ended items for attenders only, concerning effects of the summer institutes on subsequent teaching.

A full discussion of the development of the Teacher Attitude Inventory (TAI) by Gewirtz is presented in his evaluation report. At the time of its original use, the TAI had not been validated against any independent criteria.

However, there appears to be considerable interest in this instrument; several researchers have now used it or modifications of it. Because of this interest, and because analyses of scores obtained from the TAI will be reported here, it is pertinent to repeat some description of these scores.

The original TAI contained 45 items, with which the respondent was asked to disagree or agree on a scale with four possible ratings (-2, -1, +1, +2). Arithmetically, this is a five-point scale with no middle or zero rating. Factor analysis yielded four factor scores, based on 40 items. The items originally numbered 14, 16, 32, 38, and 43 had low factor loadings and were not used by Gewirtz in calculating factor scores. These five items were dropped from the version used in this followup study; the factor scores reported here are identical to Gewirtz's.

The four factors were called: I, optimism concerning the educability of the disadvantaged child; II, flexibility or non-traditionalism in approach to teaching the disadvantaged child; III, sensitivity to the interpersonal needs of the disadvantaged child; and IV, non-fear of being physically harmed or threatened by the disadvantaged child. (This fourth factor was referred to in Gewirtz's report as fear, but here it will be reversed in sign and reported as non-fear or lack of fear).

The items making up each of the four factors are presented in Appendix A, Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4; for each factor, the items are listed in order of the magnitude of the factor loadings. Note in these tables that the number of items per factor varies; Factor I has 17 items; Factor II, 11 items; Factor III, 6 items; and Factor IV, 6 items. Therefore the possible range of scores on each factor also varies; the approximate

possible ranges are as follows: Factor I, -13.5 to +13.5; Factor II, -9.5 to +9.5; Factor III, -4.0 to +4.0; and Factor IV, -5.0 to +5.0.

For most of the TAI items, the desirable direction of response is to disagree (see Appendix A, Tables 1 - 4). The six items constituting Factor III, sensitivity, are an exception, since for these particular items the desirable response is to agree (see Appendix A, Table 3). However, all four factor scores will be reported here so that a high positive score represents a desirable score.

Data Analysis Procedures

The obtained data were analyzed by means of analyses of variance, chi square tests, and Pearson product-moment correlations. Differences were considered significant if they reached the five per cent level. In the analysis of variance tables, a significant F value indicates that, for the score being analyzed, the groups differ with respect to the variable in question - for example, attendance-nonattendance, or years of teaching experience. The interaction term in the tables answers, for example, the question of whether the difference between attenders and nonattenders is the same for public as for nonpublic school teachers; or, looked at alternatively, is the difference between (e.g.) public and nonpublic attenders the same as the difference between public and non-public nonattenders?

Analyses of variance were made in terms of the design previously outlined, comparing no summer courses, 1 or 2 courses, and 3 or 4 courses. These analyses added very little to interpretation of the data; therefore results will be reported for the collapsed attender group as a whole. However, it should not be concluded that teachers who took 3 or 4 courses

are the same as those who took 1 or 2 courses. It is quite possible that they differ in some or many ways, but when partitioned into subgroups according to the classification variables, there were too few subjects to furnish reliable evidence about differences.

No differences were found among the nine observers in their patterns of rating; therefore all observers' ratings will be pooled.

FINDINGS

Description of Subjects

Table 1 shows frequency distributions for the four major groups of subjects by sex, grade level taught, years of teaching experience, and years of experience in teaching disadvantaged children. Altogether, there were 87 women and 17 men; 12 of the men were in the public schools. In the nonpublic schools, 5 of the 27 attenders were nuns, whereas 18 of the 27 nonattenders were nuns. With respect to grade level taught, Table 1 shows that the attender-nonattender pairs were closely matched. The amount of teaching experience was about the same for public attenders and nonattenders; a relatively small proportion of them (16 per cent) had more than 10 years' experience. The nonpublic attenders were evenly spread over the whole range of teaching experience, but the nonpublic nonattenders were concentrated at the level of little experience (less than three years) or over 20 years' experience, with few at the intermediate levels. Distributions for age were also inspected, but are not shown in the table since they paralleled those for teaching experience. In general all these teachers had had less experience teaching disadvantaged children than general teaching experience. This difference was most pronounced for the nonpublic nonattenders; 20 of the 27 had had less than three years' experience teaching disadvantaged children.

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS BY SEX, GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT,
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
TEACHING DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

	Attendees		Nonattendees	
	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic
<u>Total</u>	25	27	25	27
<u>Sex</u>				
Female	18	25	20	24
Male	7	2	5	3
<u>Grade Level Taught</u>				
1 - 3	6	11	7	10
4 - 6	17	12	16	11
7 - 9	2	4	2	6
<u>Years Teaching Experience</u>				
0 - 2	7	4	8	10
3 - 5	8	5	10	1
6 - 10	6	8	3	4
11 - 20	4	5	3	2
Over 20	0	5	1	10
<u>Years Teaching Disadvantaged Children</u>				
0 - 2	8	7	8	20
3 - 5	7	10	11	1
6 - 10	7	6	5	3
11 - 20	3	4	1	1
Over 20	0	0	0	2

TAI Factor Scores

The means and analyses of variance of the four TAI factor scores are shown in Appendix A, Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8; the top half of each of these tables shows the means for attenders and nonattenders in relation to four of the classification variables analyzed by Gewirtz. These variables are type of school (public or nonpublic), grade level taught, years of teaching experience, and years of experience in teaching disadvantaged children. (For the reader who wishes to make close comparisons between the two sets of data, note that the subclassifications are not identical in the two studies; for example, under grade level Gewirtz grouped grades 1 to 6, whereas here these grade levels are divided into two subclassifications). One overall comment on these four tables is that almost all the mean scores are positive; thus these subjects, both attenders and nonattenders, when examined in relation to these four classification variables, tended to give responses in the desirable direction. This can be seen in the actual ranges of scores, which for all subjects combined were as follows: Factor I, -7.8 to +13.2; Factor II, -6.2 to +8.1; Factor III, -3.1 to +3.8; and Factor IV, -3.5 to +4.3.

Appendix A, Table 5 shows the results for attenders and nonattenders divided by the type of school in which they teach. On Factor I, optimism, the public school teachers as a whole were significantly more optimistic about the educability of the disadvantaged child than the nonpublic school teachers. However, this difference between public and nonpublic teachers was significantly greater for nonattenders than for attenders; in fact, the public nonattenders were the most optimistic of the four groups, and the nonpublic nonattenders were the least optimistic. On Factor II,

flexibility, the public attenders and nonattenders received almost identical mean scores. For nonpublic school teachers, attenders' scores showed more flexibility than nonattenders in their approach to teaching disadvantaged children; this difference did not quite reach statistical significance. On Factor III, sensitivity, there were no significant differences, but it is interesting to note that the nonpublic nonattenders, who scored least optimistic and least flexible, here scored as the most sensitive of the four groups. On Factor IV, attenders as a whole scored as less fearful of physical harm or threat from the disadvantaged child, but again this difference did not quite reach statistical significance.

Means on the four factor scores for attenders and nonattenders by grade level taught are shown in Appendix A, Table 6. Since the attender-nonattender pairs were closely matched on this variable, no significant differences would be expected in relation to attendance or nonattendance at the summer institutes, and there were none. Neither were there any significant differences in relation to the three categories of grade level taught. The only suggestion of a difference on any of the four factors was that teachers of grades 1 to 3 scored as slightly more sensitive than teachers of higher grades, although not significantly so.

Appendix A, Table 7 shows the factor score results in relation to years of teaching experience. There were no significant differences between attenders and nonattenders on any factor, and on only one factor did the difference approach significance; namely, the attenders tended to receive higher flexibility scores than the nonattenders. With respect to the other variable, amount of teaching experience, there were significant differences on Factors I and II. The tendency was that with

more experience, optimism and flexibility scores decreased; the nonpublic nonattenders with the least experience were an exception, in that they also received low scores on these two factors. While the differences on Factor III were not significant, again it is of interest to note that the teachers with the most experience, although they scored low on optimism and flexibility, received higher scores on sensitivity than did any other experience category.

Appendix A, Table 8 shows similar results for attenders and nonattenders in relation to years of experience in teaching disadvantaged children. More significant differences were found in the factor scores with respect to this classification variable than in the analyses of any of the three preceding classification variables. On Factor I, attenders as a group tended to be more optimistic than nonattenders, although not significantly so. Optimism scores differed significantly depending on amount of experience in teaching disadvantaged children; the less experienced teachers tended to be more optimistic. On Factor II both sets of differences were highly significant; attenders as a group scored as more flexible than nonattenders, and the less experienced teachers tended to be more flexible. On Factor III there were no significant differences, but the means showed the same tendencies as in the previous analyses; that is, the teachers with the most experience in teaching disadvantaged children received the highest sensitivity scores. On Factor IV, attenders were significantly less fearful of physical harm than the nonattenders. Scores on this factor also differed significantly in relation to amount of experience in teaching disadvantaged children; the less experienced teachers tended to be less fearful of physical harm.

Fact Items

For each fact item, distributions of teachers' ratings were obtained for public and nonpublic attenders and nonattenders; and also for teachers with less than 11 years of teaching experience and those with 11 or more years' experience. Chi square tests of all the possible group comparisons were made. There were very few significant differences and no consistent pattern of direction of differences. Table 2 lists the fact items in rank order according to the percentages of the total group who rated themselves 4 or 5, that is, said they performed the activity often or very often. The table also shows the percentages separately for attenders and nonattenders. It should be noted that a few items were included for which it was felt that the desirable or honest response could not be 5 (very often).

For most of the activities involved in these items, over half the teachers said they performed the activity often or very often. They focussed the most emphasis on getting pupils to participate actively in class, and on identifying children's specific learning problems. They tended not to involve children in planning class work, and not to base their teaching strategies on the needs of the slowest children; they probably had limited opportunities to take children on field trips and to attend educational conferences.

TABLE 2

TEACHERS' RATINGS OF FACT ITEMS IN RANK ORDER BY PER CENT OF TOTAL RATED AS HAVING BEEN PERFORMED "OFTEN" OR "VERY OFTEN" (4 or 5)

Item No.	Content	Per Cent Responding 4 or 5		
		Total Group (N=104)	Attend-ers (N=52)	Nonat-tenders (N=52)
19	Get most pupils to participate in class	96	94	98
18	Identify children's specific learning problems	91	88	94
21	Relate class work to specifics of child's environment	84	81	87
20	Vary teaching procedure to accomplish particular aims	82	83	81
26	Discuss teaching problems with colleagues	79	73	85
27	Keep informed about public programs that affect disadvantaged children	78	81	75
14	Make special displays for the classroom	74	79	69
22	Discipline children when they disrupt class work	71	71	71
23	Depart from prescribed text in presenting subjects	69	65	73
30	Feel personal satisfaction with own teaching efforts	68	71	65
15	Develop own teaching materials	64	69	60
24	Talk with parents by specific arrangement	60	54	65
28	Consult references for specific information related to teaching aims	55	50	60
16	Involve children in planning class work	38	48	29*
17	Base teaching strategies on needs of slowest children	38	46	31
25	Take children on field trips and other outside enriching experiences	33	29	37
29	Attend educational conferences	30	38	21

* Attender-nonattender difference significant at less than the .05 level.

Importance Items

The importance items were analyzed in the same way as the fact items. Again, there were very few significant chi square values. Table 3 lists the items in rank order according to the percentage of the total group who responded 4 or 5 ("quite important" or "essential to my success as a teacher"); the table also shows the percentages for attenders and nonattenders separately. For the range of content covered in these items, the listing in the table can be read as a hierarchical ordering of what these teachers deem important for successful teaching. They very rarely used ratings of 1 or 2 ("no importance" or "a little importance"). They considered it highly important to be flexible, to understand the child's social and cultural background, to identify his specific learning problems, and to have confidence in their own skills. They considered it of relatively lesser importance to their own teaching success to facilitate pupil interaction, to keep informed about news of minority groups, and to know the thinking of educational leaders about urban educational problems.

Some of the importance items were identical or very similar to certain fact items, as can be seen by comparing Tables 2 and 3. In general, for parallel items, the percentages in Table 3 are higher than those in Table 2, and in some cases considerably so. This result suggests that the teachers know what is "important" for successful teaching, but do not always find it possible to put these things into practice; or, stated another way, they aspire to do better than they themselves say they do.

TABLE 3

TEACHERS' RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE ITEMS IN RANK ORDER BY PER CENT OF TOTAL RATED "QUITE IMPORTANT" OR "ESSENTIAL" (4 or 5) TO TEACHING SUCCESS

Item No.	Content	Per Cent Responding 4 or 5		
		Total Group (N=104)	Atten- ders (N=52)	Nonat- tenders (N=52)
32	Be flexible in approach to teaching	99	98	100
40	Understand children's cultural background	98	100	96
39	Identify child's specific learning problems	96	92	100
44	Have confidence in own skills	95	96	94
36	Be creative and experimental in classroom	90	90	90
35	Maintain orderly classroom	89	90	88
34	Relate class learning to child's urban life	89	90	88
33	Reward child for successful efforts	87	88	85
37	Know new developments in techniques and curricula	82	79	85
31	Set goals for child at his level of functioning	81	75	87
41	Be familiar with community resources relevant to education	79	75	83
38	Facilitate interaction among pupils to accomplish particular teaching aims	73	71	75
43	Keep informed about current events re minority groups in New York City	67	65	69
42	Know thinking of educational leaders on urban education problems	54	50	58

Observers' Ratings

The observers' ratings provide an independent source of data about the teachers' behavior. The data analyses were similar to those for the fact and importance items, and as before very few chi square values for any of the possible comparisons were significant. Table 4 lists the items in rank order according to the percentages of teachers who were rated 4 or 5, that is, showed much of the behavior in question. Results of the observers' overall rating of the teaching-learning situation are also included at the bottom of the table, and separate percentages for attenders and nonattenders are shown. The content of many of the items rated by observers is parallel to that of some of the fact and importance items. It is immediately obvious that the percentages of teachers rated 4 or 5 by observers are considerably lower than the corresponding percentages of teachers' ratings for the fact and importance items. To some extent this disparity between the sets of percentages may reflect greater objectivity on the part of observers. To some extent this result may also be attributable to the limited period of observation; it could not be expected that there would be an opportunity for all these behaviors to appear within one hour. And the teacher's behavior may have been influenced by the observer's presence.

In this connection, observers had been instructed to mark an item "not scorable" only if there was no opportunity for the occurrence of the behavior in question. The observers seldom used the "not scorable" option, except on two items - Nos. 12 and 13, where this option was used about 19 per cent of the time. These two items asked the extent to which the teacher encouraged the children to consult sources and verify

answers, and encouraged them to consult with each other. The latter behavior, however, when it was scored, was judged to occur infrequently.

Apart from the magnitude of the percentages in Table 4, comparison with Tables 2 and 3 reveals some congruence among rank ordering of items. For example, observers rated 71 per cent of the teachers as enjoying teaching, and in their self-ratings 68 per cent of the teachers indicated that they felt satisfaction with their teaching efforts. At the other end of the scale of percentages there was also some correspondence; as noted above, teachers were seldom observed to encourage pupils to consult with each other (although attenders did so significantly more than nonattenders), and teachers rated this item near the bottom of the list in rank order of importance.

TABLE 4

OBSERVERS' RATINGS LISTED IN RANK ORDER BY PER CENT
OF TOTAL RATED 4 or 5

Item No.	Extent to which:	Per Cent Rated 4 or 5		
		Total Group (N=104)	Atten- ders (N=52)	Nonat- tenders (N=52)
20	Teacher (T) seems to enjoy teaching	71	67	75
7	Content of T's presentation is appropriate	70	71	69
17	T respects children (C) as individuals	70	69	71
16	T sets standards for C's behavior that are conducive to learning	69	63	75
2	C are responsive to T	68	71	65
15	T checks on whether C have acquired knowledge she was teaching	67	63	71
8	T's use of language is appropriate	65	67	63
9	Pacing of learning activities is appropriate	65	62	69
3	C are interested and involved in class activities	64	62	67
6	Materials used by T are adequate and appropriate	61	58	63
14	Lesson is part of a continuous process	57	54	60
1	T made classroom look attractive	56	65	46*
5	C are interested in materials presented by T	56	54	58
10	T can vary her approach to meet individual needs	51	50	52
11	T encourages questioning and pupil initiative	47	44	50
4	C show desire to explore, to seek answers	42	48	37
18	T is aware of special needs of individual C	40	42	38
12	T encourages C to consult sources, to verify information	39	38	40
19	T relates class work to the C's environment and life experiences	36	31	40
13	T encourages C to consult with each other	28	37	19*
21	Observer's overall evaluation	60	62	58

*Attender-nonattender difference significant at less than the .05 level.

The item next to the bottom of the list in Table 4 (No. 19) is of interest because of the lack of congruence among the sets of ratings. The question to observers was, "To what extent does the teacher attempt to relate the class work to the pupils' environment and life experiences?" Observers rated 36 per cent of the teachers 4 or 5. According to the printed description of the summer institutes' program, all the summer courses emphasized the importance of this behavior. In Table 2 a similar fact item appears near the top of the list, that is, 84 per cent of the teachers said they often or very often related "class work to specific conditions or circumstances in the children's lives and environment." And in Table 3, 89 per cent of the teachers considered it "quite important" or "essential" to their own teaching success to relate classroom learning to the child's urban life. The lack of correspondence among these three sets of data suggests that there is a gap that has not been bridged between the verbal and the behavioral levels of knowledge and understanding. The teachers' responses to the open-ended questions, when compared with the above sets of data, tend to confirm this suggestion, as will be shown below.

Correlations Between Items

As the reader has seen, there were correspondences in the content of some fact items, importance items, and observers' rating scales. Correlations were obtained, for attenders and nonattenders separately, between selected pairs of items where it seemed reasonable to expect some relationship (fact vs. fact, fact vs. importance, fact vs. observer's rating, etc). Very few of these correlations were significantly different

from zero, and these had been selected as the most promising; therefore these correlations will not be reported, but the lack of significance supports the suggestion of a gap between teachers' attitudes and behavior.

The observer's overall rating was correlated with each of the TAI factor scores. For nonattenders, these four correlations were zero. For attenders, they were as follows: overall rating with Factor I, +.27; with II, +.34 (significantly greater than zero); with III, -.01; and with IV, +.17. Thus only the flexibility score, and only for attenders, showed a suggestion of relationship to the observer's overall evaluation of the teaching-learning situation.

Open-Ended Questions

The data thus far reported were obtained from multiple-choice response situations. It was considered important to obtain at least some free-choice responses, with the possibility of more than one response. Both the attenders and the nonattenders were asked two open-ended questions. The first question was, "What training do you think would be helpful to you in your teaching? Or what further help would you like to have?" Some subjects gave more than one response. Responses were coded as shown in Table 5. For all subjects combined, the most frequent request was for courses in techniques and methods for teaching disadvantaged children. These responses stressed a desire for concrete, specific information. There was not one request specifically for summer courses, although perhaps this was implicit. Many responses clearly indicated a desire for continuing help during the school year; for example, requests for more practice teaching, observation

of master or experienced teachers, continuing workshops, and monthly seminars. The second category of responses listed in Table 5 is closely related to the first, but these responses referred to information about new curricula and to specific subject matter; for example, "Puerto Rican history," "a course in Spanish," "a master's degree in child guidance," "creative art," or "learn to play a musical instrument."

There were two other common responses: courses to help gain an understanding of the personality and environment of disadvantaged children, requested more frequently by nonpublic school teachers; and administrative rearrangements to improve the physical aspects of teaching, requested more frequently by public school teachers.

TABLE 5

TRAINING OR FURTHER HELP DESIRED BY TEACHERS

	Total Number of Times Mentioned by 104 Teachers	<u>% of Each Group Giving Response</u>			
		Attenders		Nonattenders	
		Public (N=25)	Nonpub. (N=27)	Public (N=25)	Nonpub. (N=27)
1. Courses in and demonstrations of skills, techniques, and methods for teaching disadvantaged children	42	28%	30%	72%	33%
2. Courses and current information on new curricula and materials in specific subject areas	21	24	26	24	7
3. Courses to gain understanding and insight into personality and environment of disadvantaged children	23	16	22	16	33
4. Administrative rearrangements to improve physical aspects of teaching	21	36	22	16	7
5. Seminars and/or continuing workshops to exchange ideas with other teachers	8	12	7	8	4
6. More and better teacher-parent-school-community relationships and communication	4	8	0	4	4
7. None (no help wanted, N=2, or no response given, N=24)	26	20	19	20	41

Looking at the four groups separately, there was one striking difference among them; namely, almost three-fourths of the public school nonattenders wanted help with teaching techniques and methods, whereas for the other three groups this figure was about 30 per cent.

The second open-ended question asked of all subjects was, "What qualities do you feel are of very great importance for a successful teacher of disadvantaged children?" Responses were coded as shown in Table 6. The most frequently mentioned quality by far was sensitivity (or its equivalent). Patience was also frequently mentioned. In comparison with Table 3, where teachers rated flexibility as very important, in this free response situation flexibility was mentioned by only 36 per cent of the teachers as being "of very great importance."

The four separate subgroups were fairly similar in their patterns of response. Public school teachers as a group tended to mention professional competence and a positive attitude toward self and others more often than did the nonpublic teachers; and the latter more often mentioned the importance of sensitivity and patience.

TABLE 6

QUALITIES SUGGESTED BY TEACHERS AS OF VERY GREAT IMPORTANCE
FOR SUCCESSFUL TEACHING OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

	Total Number of Times Mentioned by 104 Teachers	<u>% of Each Group Giving Response</u>			
		Attenders		Nonattenders	
		Public (N=25)	Nonpub. (N=27)	Public (N=25)	Nonpub. (N=27)
1. Sensitivity, understanding, fairness	79	64%	85%	76%	78%
2. Patience	52	40	52	48	59
3. Flexibility	37	28	30	52	33
4. Positive attitude toward self and others	23	32	4	32	22
5. Professional competence	18	32	7	28	4
6. Dedication	14	12	19	12	11
7. Firmness	13	0	15	24	11
8. Sense of humor	8	8	4	12	7
9. No response given	4	0	4	4	7

Two other open-ended questions were asked only of the attenders. The first, in two parts, was, "Has your attendance at the summer institutes affected your teaching this year?" "Why or in what ways do you feel it did or did not have an effect?" Responses were coded as shown in Table 7. Nearly three-fourths of this group of 52 teachers listed positive effects; more nonpublic than public school teachers reacted positively to the summer institutes experience. The most common positive reasons given by the teachers were that they learned new methods and techniques, and that they gained from the focus on the needs and problems of disadvantaged children. Both these responses were relatively more common from the nonpublic teachers. Of the 15 who said the institutes had no effect on their subsequent teaching, 10 said they learned nothing new, and 8 of these were public school teachers. The remaining three categories listed at the bottom of the table can all be considered as statements that the teacher felt she got nothing practical and specific to meet her own needs.

The second question asked of attenders only was, "Looking back on your summer institute experience, what was the single most important thing you got out of it?" To this question, also, a few teachers gave more than one response. The results are shown in Table 8. Although 15 teachers, above, said the institutes had no effect, here only 7 could state no gain. The attenders valued most the opportunity to exchange ideas with others teaching in similar situations; closely related are the frequent mentions of information about teaching techniques, methods, curricula, and materials. All these categories of responses were relatively more frequently mentioned by the nonpublic than by the public school teachers.

TABLE 7

EFFECTS OF SUMMER INSTITUTES ON ATTENDERS' TEACHING
DURING THE SUBSEQUENT SCHOOL YEAR

<u>Direction of Response</u>	<u>Total (N=52)</u>		<u>Public (N=25)</u>		<u>Nonpublic (N=27)</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Positive Effect	37	71	15	60	22	81
No Effect	15	29	10	40	5	19

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Total Number of Times Mentioned</u>	<u>% of Group Giving Response</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Nonpublic</u>
<u>Positive Effect</u>			
1. Learned new methods and techniques	19	20%	52%
2. Focussed on needs and problems of disadvantaged children	16	28	33
3. Reinforced previous attitudes and/or knowledge	6	16	7
<u>No Effect</u>			
4. Nothing new; repetitious; waste of time	10	32	7
5. Courses too theoretical	4	8	7
6. Courses unrelated to personal teaching situation	4	8	7
7. Courses poorly prepared and/or presented	4	8	7

TABLE 8

MOST IMPORTANT THING ATTENDERS GAINED
FROM THE SUMMER INSTITUTES

	<u>Total Number of Times Mentioned By 52 Teachers</u>	<u>% of Group Giving Response</u>	
		<u>Public (N=25)</u>	<u>Nonpublic (N=27)</u>
1. Exchange of ideas with other teachers	16	20%	41%
2. Teaching techniques and methods; ideas and sources for curricula and materials	16	20	41
3. Inspiration, motivation, optimism	9	20	15
4. Knowledge, understanding, sensitivity about the disadvantaged child and his special problems	7	16	11
5. Knowledge of community and its resources (field trips)	4	8	7
6. Stipend; little or nothing; no response	7	20	7

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the preceding section, findings were presented but little comment was made about them. In general these results agree with those obtained by Dr. Gewirtz and thus support his recommendations, which will not be repeated here.

Because of the problems involved in obtaining subjects for this followup study, it is not warranted to reach firm conclusions concerning effects of attendance at the summer institutes from comparisons of the particular attenders and nonattenders studied here. We selected the attenders' names randomly, but the final sample of attenders was not a random one; rather, it can be regarded as a cooperative sample, willing to be observed for an hour, and willing to fill out an eight-page questionnaire. Neither can the nonattenders be regarded as a random sample; their names were supplied by the principals and they had to be equally cooperative, without any reward. The only restriction on the principals' choices, besides furnishing names of cooperative teachers, was in terms of the grade level taught. Apart from that, it seems likely that the principals would nominate their better teachers. This would reduce differences between the attenders and nonattenders. As for the attenders, they may represent a variety of selective factors; their decision to attend the institutes may have involved high motivation, or a feeling of lack of adequate preparation, or both these factors, or many other possibilities. These matters are speculative, but it seems likely that divergent factors within the attender and nonattender samples operated to obscure differences between them.

Keeping in mind these sampling limitations, the analyses of the TAI factor scores suggested that, seven to nine months after attending the

institutes, the attenders were somewhat more optimistic and were more flexible in their attitudes and less fearful of harm than the nonattenders. Attenders and nonattenders did not differ in their sensitivity scores. This factor may involve characteristics that are relatively resistant to change; or the measurement may be faulty. The sensitivity score is based on only six items, and Gewirtz found this score to be the least reliable of the four factor scores. Comments on the TAI as an instrument will be made below. With respect to the classification variables examined, it was found that optimism and flexibility scores decreased and sensitivity scores increased with experience. This suggests a hypothesis that the inexperienced teacher, while she is generally optimistic and flexible, is concerned with mastering the basics of teaching, whereas for the experienced teacher this is no longer a problem and she can therefore pay attention to (be sensitive to) the needs of individual children.

The significance of any reported differences between public and nonpublic school teachers is vitiated by the fact that the nonpublic nonattender sample contained relatively large proportions of very inexperienced and very experienced teachers and of nuns. It might have been enlightening to conduct further analyses to eliminate statistically the effects of differing amounts of experience, but the limited budget allotted for this followup evaluation precluded such analyses. In future similar studies, the results suggest that it would be desirable to select samples of subjects stratified with respect to amount of teaching experience or, where appropriate, experience in teaching disadvantaged children. A category of "over 10 years" should be adequate to encompass the "most experienced" teachers; and this would help to avoid small numbers of cases at this extreme.

Since the Teacher Attitude Inventory is likely to be used by other investigators, a few suggestions will be offered here for its modification. First, it seems desirable to insert a mid-scale rating of zero. Second, the wording of items should be modified so that each factor contains some items with which it is desirable to agree and some with which it is desirable to disagree. From Factor I, optimism, some items with low factor loadings could be eliminated. Factor III, sensitivity, needs more items so as to increase the reliability of measurement. We are working on a modification of the TAI along these lines for future use, and adding items which, we hope, measure sensitivity. The stability of the factors and the effects of these modifications can then be tested by a new factor analysis.

It was as true of the nonattenders as of the attenders that, for the criteria examined, their aspirations were higher than their performance, both as they stated it and as it was observed. With respect to one criterion, relating class work to the pupils' environment and experience, it would seem that attenders should have surpassed nonattenders. A possible explanation of their failure to do so, even though they recognized its importance, can be gleaned from their responses to the open-ended questions. Their stressed desire for practical, specific techniques and skills makes clear the great difference between knowing a principle and knowing how to put that principle into practice. Dr. Gewirtz recommended careful screening of applicants so as to place them in courses that will meet their needs. This is a difficult task, but it might be facilitated by asking applicants to make a very specific statement of what they hope to gain from a course.

If the data in the original evaluation had not been collected anonymously, it would have been possible to look for changes during the subsequent school year within individuals, and then to try to relate the observed changes to meaningful variables. However, if the original data had not been collected anonymously, it is perfectly possible that those results would have been different.

The implication of these statements is that to do an adequate followup study of a program requires consideration of this possibility at the time when the original project and the original evaluation are being conducted. Even if it is not certain that funds will be available for a followup study, it could certainly do no harm to consider, in all evaluations, at the stage of evaluation design, the question of whether a followup study would be desirable, and what information it should yield. This procedure could also be economically advantageous, since with slight modifications or with slight additional expenditures during the original evaluation, the cost of a followup study might be greatly reduced.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1

FACTOR I - OPTIMISM
ITEMS LISTED IN ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF FACTOR LOADINGS

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Content</u>
62	.54	Because the disadvantaged child is unused to intellectual stimulation, he should be exposed to it in very small doses.
66	.52	It is unrealistic for the teacher of the disadvantaged child to set her sights high.
45	.50	Even the most creative teacher of disadvantaged children can expect to attain only very limited gains with them.
58	.45	The new curriculum approaches developed for gifted children have little relevance for teaching the disadvantaged child.
53	.44	Because of his overly-concrete mode of thinking, the disadvantaged child is rarely capable of handling abstract concepts.
47	.42	The disadvantaged child is not a good subject for "inductive" teaching.
52	.41	Since the disadvantaged child learns best through constant repetition of the same material, the "spiral" approach is not applicable to him.
84	.41	If a teacher succeeds in motivating only one out of five in a class of disadvantaged children, she is doing well.
83	.41	The disadvantaged child's curriculum should emphasize only the most essential skills and knowledge he will need to get along.
49	.40	The curriculum for disadvantaged children should consist of self-contained activities which are minimally related to what has gone before or what is to come.
74	.36	Because the disadvantaged child displays a delayed learning "readiness," more complex concepts should not be introduced until the later grades.
65	.36	Most disadvantaged children do not have the "stick-to-it-iveness" to use programmed self-instructional devices.

- continued -

FACTOR I (continued)
ITEMS LISTED IN ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF FACTOR LOADINGS

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Content</u>
59	.34	The search for new curricula for the disadvantaged child is too recent to have provided approaches of concrete value to the teacher.
56	.33	One of the hardest things to get used to about teaching disadvantaged children is that most of them come to school quite unclean.
60	.33	A teacher of disadvantaged children should focus on reading and give only residual attention to other curriculum areas.
63	.32	One of the frustrations in working with disadvantaged children is that they do not really appreciate your efforts.
57	.27	The disadvantaged child's capacity for learning is pretty well set by the time he reaches school age.

TABLE 2

FACTOR II - FLEXIBILITY
ITEMS LISTED IN ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF FACTOR LOADINGS

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Content</u>
73	.50	The teacher of disadvantaged children should stick to recommended techniques and avoid experimentation.
76	.50	A disadvantaged child's use of "hip" expressions should be corrected immediately.
50	.42	The teacher of the disadvantaged child should avoid references to the child's home and community in her lessons because these are likely to be painful and unpleasant subjects for the pupil.
72	.39	Teaching the disadvantaged child is truly a matter of all work and no play.
77	.39	Role-playing is not suitable for the disadvantaged child because of his difficulty in expressing himself.
80	.39	A disadvantaged child should be helped from the beginning to understand that his language is not the language he is expected to use in school.
71	.37	The disadvantaged child requires a consistent environment; therefore team teaching is not a suitable approach for him.
46	.37	Since the disadvantaged child's verbal ability is so poor the teacher should take every opportunity to correct his speech errors.
79	.37	A teacher cannot be expected to mitigate intellectual damage suffered by a disadvantaged child by the time he reaches school age.
82	.36	In the battle to overcome his difficult environment, the disadvantaged child has not developed a sense of fair play.
70	.31	Having been raised in a ghetto the disadvantaged child is not aware that his culture is different from that of society-at-large.

TABLE 3

FACTOR III - SENSITIVITY
ITEMS LISTED IN ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF FACTOR LOADINGS

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Content</u>
64	.41	The disadvantaged child has a greater need to experience success in school than the middle class child.
67	.33	Teaching disadvantaged children can be as satisfying an experience as teaching advantaged children.
61	.32	The disadvantaged child's ability to observe is not as impaired as his verbal ability.
68	.28	The disadvantaged child should not be made to feel that middle class values are more acceptable to the teacher than lower class values.
81	.28	Especially with disadvantaged children, the teacher should check to see if every homework and classroom assignment has been completed.
55	.28	In reaching the disadvantaged child, the teacher's personal contribution is more important than having the proper curricular materials.

TABLE 4

FACTOR IV - NON-FEAR OF PHYSICAL HARM
ITEMS LISTED IN ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF FACTOR LOADINGS

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Content</u>
54	.48	The disadvantaged child's frequent outbursts of hostility are really hard to take.
48	.42	Few teachers prefer to work with disadvantaged children.
51	.41	Most teachers are fearful about teaching in disadvantaged neighborhoods.
75	.39	A teacher at a disadvantaged school runs substantial risk of being physically harmed.
78	.35	As long as the parents of disadvantaged children remain apathetic and irresponsible, the teachers can expect to accomplish very little with these children.
69	.32	It's discouraging to try new teaching approaches with the disadvantaged when the children do not even pay attention to what the teacher is saying.

TABLE 5

ATTENDANCE-NONATTENDANCE BY TYPE OF SCHOOL: MEAN SCORES
AND ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR EACH OF THE
FOUR TAI FACTORS

Type of School	Number of Cases		MEAN SCORES							
	Att.	Nonatt.	Factor I Optimism		Factor II Flexibility		Factor III Sensitivity		Factor IV Non-Fear of Harm	
	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.
Public	25	25	6.5	7.8	4.9	4.8	1.7	1.9	1.1	0.7
Nonpublic	27	27	5.8	3.0	3.8	1.9	1.9	2.2	1.1	0.4

Source of Variation	df	ANALYSES OF VARIANCE							
		Factor I		Factor II		Factor III		Factor IV	
		MS	F	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
Attendance-Nonattendance	1	13.09	.66	26.35	3.79	1.16	.92	9.11	2.70
Type of School	1	201.09	10.11**	99.75	14.35***	1.92	1.53	.92	.27
Interaction	1	109.63	5.51*	20.89	3.01	.00	.00	.37	.11
Within Cells	100	19.90		6.95		1.26		3.38	
Total	103	22.49		8.19		1.25		3.38	

A6

*Significant at less than the .05 level.

**Significant at less than the .01 level.

***Significant at less than the .001 level.

TABLE 6

ATTENDANCE-NONATTENDANCE BY GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT: MEAN SCORES
AND ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR EACH OF THE
FOUR TAI FACTORS

MEAN SCORES											
Grade Level Taught		Number of Cases		Factor I		Factor II		Factor III		Factor IV	
				Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.
		Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.
1-3	17	17	17	5.1	4.4	3.3	2.9	1.9	2.4	0.7	0
4-6	29	29	27	6.7	6.1	5.0	3.7	1.7	1.9	1.2	0.6
7-9	6	6	8	6.0	4.8	3.9	2.8	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.3

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE											
Source of Variation		Factor I		Factor II		Factor III		Factor IV			
		MS	F	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
Attendance-Nonattendance	1	12.49	.54	8.79	1.09	.19	.15	1.75	.52		
Grade Level Taught	2	9.31	.40	3.85	.48	2.47	1.94	2.74	.82		
Interaction	2	2.19	.09	.45	.06	.12	.09	.42	.13		
Within Cells	98	23.32		8.05		1.27		3.35			
Total	103	22.49		8.19		1.25		3.38			

TABLE 7

ATTENDANCE-NONATTENDANCE BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR
EACH OF THE FOUR TAI FACTORS

Years of Teaching Experience	MEAN SCORES							
	Number of Cases		Factor I		Factor II		Factor III	
			Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.
0-2	11	18	8.4	4.5	5.1	3.4	1.6	2.0
3-5	13	11	5.7	8.7	5.0	5.3	1.1	2.1
6-10	14	7	5.8	7.9	4.0	4.5	2.1	1.9
11-20	9	5	6.4	3.9	3.9	1.0	2.4	1.8
Over 20	5	11	2.6	2.4	2.4	1.4	2.4	2.2
							0.8	0.1
							1.4	1.3
							1.1	1.7
							1.0	0.5
							1.3	-0.3

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE							
Source of Variation	df	Factor I		Factor II		Factor III	
		MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
Attendance-Nonattendance	1	2.20	.11	20.98	2.98	.18	.15
Years Teaching Experience	4	63.95	3.17*	33.21	4.72**	1.25	1.03
Interaction	4	37.79	1.88	8.72	1.24	1.69	1.39
Within Cells	94	20.14		7.04		1.22	
Total	103	22.49		8.19		1.25	

*Significant at less than the .05 level.

**Significant at less than the .01 level.

TABLE 8

ATTENDANCE-NONATTENDANCE BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING
DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN: MEAN SCORES AND ANALYSES
OF VARIANCE FOR EACH OF THE FOUR TAI FACTORS

MEAN SCORES										
Years Teaching Dis- advantaged Children	Number of Cases		Factor I		Factor II		Factor III		Factor IV	
			Optimism		Flexibility		Sensitivity		Non-Fear of Harm	
			Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.	Att.	Nonatt.
0-2	15	28	7.5	4.2	4.6	2.9	1.7	2.1	0.7	0.5
3-5	17	12	5.5	9.0	4.4	5.2	1.3	2.1	1.7	1.3
6-10	13	8	4.9	6.2	3.5	4.2	2.3	1.6	0.9	0.4
11-20	7	2	6.9	3.8	5.1	0.2	2.4	2.5	1.1	-1.0
Over 20	0	2	--	-1.9	--	-3.5	--	1.8	--	-1.7

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE									
Source of Variation	df	Factor I		Factor II		Factor III		Factor IV	
		MS	F	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
Attendance-Nonattendance	1	48.28	2.35	84.58	12.50***	.12	.10	17.66	5.38*
Yrs. Teaching Disad. Children	4	84.81	4.14**	72.72	10.75***	.93	.76	10.09	3.07*
Interaction	4	12.27	.60	1.35	.20	.87	.71	1.09	.33
Within Cells	94	20.51		6.77		1.23		3.28	
Total	103	22.49		8.19		1.25		3.38	

A9

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	df	Factor I		Factor II		Factor III		Factor IV	
		MS	F	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
Attendance-Nonattendance	1	48.28	2.35	84.58	12.50***	.12	.10	17.66	5.38*
Yrs. Teaching Disad. Children	4	84.81	4.14**	72.72	10.75***	.93	.76	10.09	3.07*
Interaction	4	12.27	.60	1.35	.20	.87	.71	1.09	.33
Within Cells	94	20.51		6.77		1.23		3.28	
Total	103	22.49		8.19		1.25		3.38	

*Significant at less than the .05 level.

**Significant at less than the .01 level.

***Significant at less than the .001 level.

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

FOLLOW UP STUDY OF 1966 SUMMER INSTITUTES FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED
CHILDREN

List of Instruments

Classroom Observation

B1

Questionnaire for Teachers

B4

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

Title I Evaluations

Followup Study of Summer Institutes
Classroom Observation

Teacher _____

School _____

Grade or Subject _____

Principal _____

Date _____

Observer _____

For each numbered item below, please circle a number between 1 and 5 to indicate the extent to which the described behavior is shown. If you have no basis on which to judge a particular item, circle 0, meaning not scorable. In the blank space underneath each item, please comment on what led to your rating, cite specific incidents you observed, etc.

To what extent:	<u>Little</u>					<u>Much</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Scorable</u>
	1	2	3	4	5		0
1. Has the teacher attempted to make the classroom look attractive in a way that is appropriate to the children's age level? Comment:							0
2. Are the children responsive to the teacher? Comment:							0
3. Do the pupils show interest and involvement in the class activities? Comment:							0
4. Do the children show curiosity, desire to explore, to discover, to seek answers? Comment:							0
5. Do the children show interest in the materials presented by the teacher? Comment:							0
6. Are the materials used by the teacher adequate and appropriate for the class? Comment:							0
7. Is the content of the teacher's presentation appropriate for the class? Comment:							0

<u>To what extent:</u>	<u>Little</u>					<u>Much</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>scorable</u>
	1	2	3	4	5		0
8. Is the teacher's use of language appropriate for the children? (For example, does she make adaptations for children who have language difficulties?) Comment:							0
9. Is the pacing of the learning activities appropriate for the pupils? Comment?	1	2	3	4	5		0
10. Does the teacher show that she can vary her teaching approach to meet the needs of particular pupils? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5		0
11. Does the teacher encourage questioning, suggestions, and other evidences of pupil initiative? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5		0
12. Does the teacher encourage the children to consult sources, references, etc. to seek answers or verify information? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5		0
13. Does the teacher encourage pupils to consult with each other? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5		0
14. Is the lesson part of a continuous process? That is, to what extent does the teacher refer to prior learnings and furnish leads to future learning? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5		0
15. Does the teacher check on whether the pupils have acquired the knowledge she has been teaching? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5		0
16. Does the teacher set standards for the children's behavior which are conducive to learning? Comment:	1	2	3	4	5		0

<u>To what extent:</u>	<u>Little</u>		<u>Much</u>		<u>Not</u> <u>scorable</u>	
	1	2	3	4	5	0
17. Does the teacher show respect for the children as individuals? Comment:						
18. Does the teacher show awareness of special needs of individual children? (For example, show consideration of a child's possible fatigue, hunger, or need for special work different from the regular class work.) Comment:						
19. Does the teacher attempt to relate the class work to the pupils' environment and life experiences? Comment:						
20. Does the teacher seem to enjoy teaching? Comment:						
21. Give your overall evaluation of the teaching-learning situation you observed. Comment:	<u>Poor</u> 1	2	3	4	<u>Excellent</u> 5	

Title I Evaluations

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

FOLLOWUP STUDY OF SUMMER INSTITUTES
Questionnaire for Teachers

1-3. No. _____

Teacher _____

School _____

Date _____

For each item below, please circle the number in front of the answer which applies to you.

4. In which type of school do you now teach?
 1. Public
 2. Nonpublic
5. How many courses did you take in last summer's institutes for the teaching of disadvantaged children?
 1. None
 2. One or two courses
 3. Three or four courses
6. Sex
 1. Male
 2. Female
7. In what age group are you?
 1. 24 or less
 2. 25 - 34
 3. 35 - 44
 4. 45 - 54
 5. 55 or more
8. What grade level do you teach now?
 1. Grade 3 or lower
 2. Grade 4, 5, or 6
 3. Grade 7 or higher
 4. Other; specify: _____
9. For how many years have you taught? Do not include this year.
 1. Less than 3 years
 2. 3 - 5 years
 3. 6 - 10 "
 4. 11 - 20 "
 5. More than 20 years

10. For how many years have you taught disadvantaged children? Do not include this year.
1. Less than 3 years
 2. 3 - 5 years
 3. 6 - 10 "
 4. 11 - 20 "
 5. More than 20 years
11. Are you teaching any disadvantaged children now?
1. Yes
 2. No
12. Do you want to teach disadvantaged children in the future?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Not sure
13. Under which New York City teaching license are you working?
1. Common branches regular
 2. Early childhood regular
 3. Common branches substitute
 4. Early childhood substitute
 5. Other; specify: _____

Listed below are specific practices, procedures, and reactions teachers sometimes report. Obviously not all teachers report all of these. Please think back over your classroom teaching during this school year and indicate how often you have done each of the things listed. Remember, there is no implication that every teacher could or should have done all these things, so please try to make your ratings factual; that is, rate what has actually happened this year. Please rate each item using the following scale:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Often
5. Very often

Circle one number between 1 and 5 for each item.

	I have done this:				
	Never	Rare- ly	Some- times	Often	Very Often
14. Making special displays or decorations for the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Developing my own teaching materials for use in class.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Involving the children in the planning of class work.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Basing most of my teaching strategies on the needs of the slowest children.	1	2	3	4	5

	I have done this:				
	Never	Rare- ly	Some- times	Often	Very Often
18. Identifying children's specific learning problems.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Getting most of the pupils to participate actively in class.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Making deliberate variations in my teaching procedure in order to accomplish particular teaching aims.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Relating class work to specific conditions or circumstances in the children's lives and environment.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Disciplining children when they disrupt the class work.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Departing from the prescribed textbooks in the presentation of subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Talking with parents of children by my arrangement (that is, at times other than open school week or at meetings which are part of the school routine).	1	2	3	4	5
25. Taking children on field trips, or providing other first-hand enriching experiences, outside the regular class routine.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Discussing teaching problems with my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Keeping myself informed concerning public programs which affect disadvantaged children, via newspapers, TV, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Consulting library or other reference sources for some particular information related to my specific teaching purposes.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Attending educational conferences or conventions.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Having a feeling of personal satisfaction with my teaching efforts.	1	2	3	4	5

If you wish to make any comments on your answers to items 14-30, please do so here.

Listed below are several items which some people have suggested as important to success in teaching. How important do you consider each of the items below to your success as a teacher? Please rate using the following scale:

1. Has no importance to my success as a teacher.
2. Has a little importance.
3. Has some importance.
4. Quite important.
5. Essential to my success as a teacher.

As before, circle one number between 1 and 5 for each item.

		The importance of this item to my success as a teacher:				
		No imp. 1	A Little imp. 2	Some imp. 3	Quite imp. 4	Essen- tial 5
31.	Setting goals for each child in terms of his own level of functioning.					
32.	Being flexible in my approach to teaching the children.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Rewarding the child for his successful efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Relating classroom learning to the child's urban life.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Maintaining an orderly classroom atmosphere.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Being creative and experimental in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Knowing about new developments in teaching techniques and curricula.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Facilitating interaction among pupils in order to accomplish particular teaching aims.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Identifying a child's specific learning problems.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Understanding the children's social and cultural background.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Being familiar with community resources and agencies in the metropolitan area which are relevant to education.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Knowing the thinking of educational leaders concerning urban educational problems.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	Keeping myself informed about current events pertaining to minority groups in New York City.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Having confidence regarding my own skills and expectations.	1	2	3	4	5

Each of the statements listed below expresses an attitude or concept concerning the disadvantaged child. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement according to the following scale:

If you agree strongly, circle +2.
 If you agree somewhat, circle +1.
 If you disagree somewhat, circle -1.
 If you disagree strongly, circle -2.

Please work quickly, since first impressions are usually the best.

	<u>Disagr.</u>	<u>Agree</u>	
45. Even the most creative teacher of disadvantaged children can expect to attain only very limited gains with them.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
46. Since the disadvantaged child's verbal ability is so poor the teacher should take every opportunity to correct his speech errors.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
47. The disadvantaged child is not a good subject for "inductive" teaching.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
48. Few teachers prefer to work with disadvantaged children.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
49. The curriculum for disadvantaged children should consist of self-contained activities which are minimally related to what has gone before or what is to come.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
50. The teacher of the disadvantaged child should avoid references to the child's home and community in her lessons because these are likely to be painful and unpleasant subjects for the pupil.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
51. Most teachers are fearful about teaching in disadvantaged neighborhoods.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
52. Since the disadvantaged child learns best through constant repetition of the same material, the "spiral" approach is not applicable to him.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
53. Because of his overly-concrete mode of thinking, the disadvantaged child is rarely capable of handling abstract concepts.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
54. The disadvantaged child's frequent outbursts of hostility are really hard to take.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
55. In reaching the disadvantaged child, the teacher's personal contribution is more important than having the proper curricula materials.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
56. One of the hardest things to get used to about teaching disadvantaged children is that most of them come to school quite unclean.	-2	-1 +1 +2	
57. The disadvantaged child's capacity for learning is pretty well set by the time he reaches school age.	-2	-1 +1 +2	

		<u>Disagr.</u>	<u>Agree</u>	
58.	The new curriculum approaches developed for gifted children have little relevance for teaching the disadvantaged child.	-2	-1	+1 +2
59.	The search for new curricula for the disadvantaged child is too recent to have provided approaches of concrete value to the teacher.	-2	-1	+1 +2
60.	A teacher of disadvantaged children should focus on reading and give only residual attention to other curriculum areas.	-2	-1	+1 +2
61.	The disadvantaged child's ability to observe is not as impaired as his verbal ability.	-2	-1	+1 +2
62.	Because the disadvantaged child is unused to intellectual stimulation, he should be exposed to it in very small doses.	-2	-1	+1 +2
63.	One of the frustrations in working with disadvantaged children is that they do not really appreciate your efforts.	-2	-1	+1 +2
64.	The disadvantaged child has a greater need to experience success in school than the middle class child.	-2	-1	+1 +2
65.	Most disadvantaged children do not have the "stick-to-it-iveness" to use programmed self-instructional devices.	-2	-1	+1 +2
66.	It is unrealistic for the teacher of the disadvantaged child to set her sights high.	-2	-1	+1 +2
67.	Teaching disadvantaged children can be as satisfying an experience as teaching advantaged children.	-2	-1	+1 +2
68.	The disadvantaged child should not be made to feel that middle class values are more acceptable to the teacher than lower class values.	-2	-1	+1 +2
69.	It's discouraging to try new teaching approaches with the disadvantaged when the children do not even pay attention to what the teacher is saying.	-2	-1	+1 +2
70.	Having been raised in a ghetto the disadvantaged child is not aware that his culture is different from that of society-at-large.	-2	-1	+1 +2
71.	The disadvantaged child requires a consistent environment; therefore team teaching is not a suitable approach for him.	-2	-1	+1 +2
72.	Teaching the disadvantaged child is truly a matter of all work and no play.	-2	-1	+1 +2
73.	The teacher of disadvantaged children should stick to recommended techniques and avoid experimentation.	-2	-1	+1 +2

	<u>Disagr.</u>	<u>Agree</u>
74. Because the disadvantaged child displays a delayed learning "readiness," more complex concepts should not be introduced until the later grades.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
75. A teacher at a disadvantaged school runs substantial risk of being physically harmed.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
76. A disadvantaged child's use of "hip" expressions should be corrected immediately.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
77. Role-playing is not suitable for the disadvantaged child because of his difficulty in expressing himself.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
78. As long as the parents of disadvantaged children remain apathetic and irresponsible, the teachers can expect to accomplish very little with these children.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
79. A teacher cannot be expected to mitigate intellectual damage suffered by a disadvantaged child by the time he reaches school age.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
80. A disadvantaged child should be helped from the beginning to understand that his language is not the language he is expected to use in school.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
81. Especially with disadvantaged children, the teacher should check to see if every homework and classroom assignment has been completed.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
82. In the battle to overcome his difficult environment, the disadvantaged child has not developed a sense of fair play.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
83. The disadvantaged child's curriculum should emphasize only the most essential skills and knowledge he will need to get along.	-2 -1 +1 +2	
84. If a teacher succeeds in motivating only one out of five in a class of disadvantaged children, she is doing well.	-2 -1 +1 +2	

In the following items, again circle the number that corresponds to your answer.

85. Have you answered the above set of Agree-Disagree questions before?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

86-87. What training do you think would be helpful to you in your teaching?
Or what further help would you like to have?

88-89. What qualities do you feel are of very great importance for a successful teacher of disadvantaged children?

If you did not attend the summer institutes, omit the remaining questions.

If you did attend any of the summer institutes, please answer the following questions.

90. What courses did you take? Circle all that apply.

1. Urban living
2. English and the language arts
3. History and the social sciences
4. Mathematics and science

91. Has your attendance at the summer institutes affected your teaching this year?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Doubtful

92-93. Please explain your answer to the above item. Why or in what ways do you feel it did or did not have an effect?

94. Looking back on your summer institute experience, what was the single most important thing you got out of it?

APPENDIX C

Staff List

•
•
•
Dr. Rita Senf, Evaluation Chairman
Senior Research Psychologist
Center for Urban Education

Mrs. May Engler
Research Assistant
Center for Urban Education

Miss Karla Shepard
Research Assistant
Center for Urban Education